Michael Timko's handwritten notes from June 1996 MasterCard U.S. Region Board Meeting (as interpreted by Mr. Timko)

3.D. Competitive Programs

AH - management recommends approval of

a policy - list major pros & cons

Pros: MC an acceptance mark owned by members -

why help competing mark(marks?)?

Cherry - picking by Amex

In short [unreadable] may see small conversion of Visa

cards to MC.

without action may be negative reaction by large

issuers.

Decrease in focus, consumer confusion

Cons: Discomfort with policy that restricts competition

In short run little effect given Visa position

REDACTED

Not firm rigid positions

Did [unreadable] survey of 15 largest revenue [unreadable] & 12

favor prohibition - three, four member - [unreadable]

Survey of 15 largest issuers, 11 favor prohibition

Proposal(ed?) is a policy as opposed to a rigid rule

HEL: two different issue(issues?, issued?), what regional position,

tomorrow global board will consider

whether matter should be regional decision,

believe US board has latitude.

P-1204

REDACTED

REDACTED

Discussion=

Hartnack - would want to make sure, can't beat prohibition, not subject to end runs.

Greenawalt - Visa passed policy in 1991; now MC now?

Wall - what would effect be [unreadable] financial implications?

AH: more than one member had said with [unreadable]

Amex if not stopped

Zebeck: [unreadable] [unreadable] who will issue

Walsh: cost of investment to brand on(in?) lost(last?) three(third?, 30?) years.

Discuss what Amex proposal is to issuers

AH: [unreadable] result that US issue(rs?) would issue 4 brands, instead of 2.

Walsh: thinks it's a brand issue

HEL: Supports policy,

seen mail share fall when non-banks let in

(co-branding)

Got(get?) letter from Harvey Golub demanding to attend

this board meeting

Greenawalt asked how [unreadable] policy differs from Visa's rule

Fairbank: haven't discussed rule versus policy

Greenawalt

Hunt

Garcia

Hartnack

6 against

Zebeck

Schaur